THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII JULY, 1960 No. 481

Editorial

ANYONE from Britain or Europe who has lectured in the U.S.A. about the relations of church and state will have discovered the difficulty of finding a common starting-point. For whereas we naturally start from a tradition in which church and state have been more or less allied, in the U.S.A. their separation is a dogmatic presupposition. Certainly our traditional church-state alliances are not what they were, and it may be that, for good or ill, we are all moving towards the American system. That is the expectation of Professor John C. Bennett in his interesting book *Christians and the State.*[1] There is nothing brash however about his advocacy of separation between church and state as the proper norm for pluralist societies. He sees that "separation" is not as simple and straightforward a concept as used to be imagined: indeed he is not altogether happy with the term "separation". Nor is he so doctrinaire as to suppose that a single pattern can, or ought to, be accepted everywhere without regard to national histories and local circumstances. He endeavours to explain to his American readers what reasonable grounds there were in Europe for the recognition of national churches,[2] though he does not allude to the way in which a parochial system ensures, at least in theory, that the ministry of the word and sacraments is maintained throughout a territorial area and every citizen is within a cure of souls. The American mind seems to be inveterately denominational and congregational, which is not of course to say congregational*ist.*

Because in England and other European countries there is an increasing tendency, not least among those who profess a high doctrine of the nature of the church, to view the relations of church and state American-wise, it is instructive for us to have the reflections of one who accepts the American doctrine of separation as normative, but who does so critically and with an awareness of its ambiguities. Dr Bennett sees that church and state are not so separate in the U.S.A. as they are commonly represented to be. There is, on the one hand, a national recognition of theism: the state is not officially secular, neutral or indifferent. And, on the other hand, most churches conceive themselves to be concerned with the whole of life, not merely with a religious segment. It is particularly in the field of education that the interests of church and state overlap, and Dr Bennett does not think that the U.S.A. has yet reached a satisfactory correlation of them. But, whatever modifications of existing practice

[1] Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1958, $4.50.

[2] It is not clear why he repeatedly describes the Church of England as "a state church" and the Church of Scotland and the Scandinavian Churches as "national churches": see pp. 4, 205 f., 257.

he is disposed to regard as reasonable, he holds that the separation or independence of church and state is best for both, and in the long run will be found to be so everywhere.

His book however is not exclusively about church-state relations. He seeks to advance Christian thought about the nature of the state as such, and especially about the grounds on which Christians should now prefer pluralist societies. He finds here a large measure of agreement between Roman Catholic writers such as M. Jacques Maritain and Protestants such as Professor Emil Brunner, and he applauds those groups in the Roman Church that are wanting the papal condemnation of civil liberties and political pluralism to be withdrawn or at any rate replaced by a different doctrine.

At the same time, Dr Bennett realizes that the maintenance of a pluralist society which practices tolerance requires in its members a common faith or common moral convictions. These do not however have to be explicitly Christian, though Christians have distinctive grounds for holding them. He instances such convictions as the right of all men to equal consideration regardless of their race or class or nation; the need of spiritual and cultural freedom; the duty of honesty and integrity in business, in scientific work, and in public and private life. Christians ought to acknowledge thankfully that there are many non-Christians who share these convictions and are fully dedicated to their preservation and extension. But Dr Bennett also has much to say about the specifically Christian grounds for allegiance to the idea of what has come to be called in ecumenical circles "the responsible society". He doubts if the term "democracy" should be used ecumenically at the present time. If he uses it himself, it is to denote a political structure that is characterized by "(1) government based upon the consent and participation of all elements in the population; (2) constitutional safeguards of freedom of expression for all persons and of the right of minorities to organize politically in order to become majorities."

Dr Bennett's book is too much directed to the American scene to make it equally useful in other countries: but it is the kind of introduction to Christianity and Politics that should be available in every country.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. "Six weeks after coming into this parish [Charlton with Brokenborough in 1853] I was left alone in charge of it. My vicar had a moor in the Island of Lewis, and he took his departure in time for the salmon, and to get his dogs into training for the grouse shooting; I did not see him again for six months. This was, of course, irregular, but the bishop made no difficulties. The fact was that the vicar's wife had joined the Roman communion, and the bishop thought that she might proselytise—a thing which, I am sure, she had not the remotest intention of doing."—A. J. Church, *Memories of Men and Books* (1908). pp. 81 f.

The Message of the Church to an Affluent Society

THE social revolution which has been taking place in this country in the last ten or fifteen years has affected the Church of England as much as any other part of the community. So many of the great causes of the past which inspired the Church with a crusading zeal have either been fought for and won, or else have proved to be irrelevant to our modern society. In some respects the Church finds itself in the same position as the Labour Party, with so much of the battle against poverty and injustice won, yet so much of its organization still geared to the conditions of the past. The fact is that the Church, being rooted in the culture of the country, finds itself lost when the culture changes. We have moved into the age of the affluent society, with its motor cars, television sets and refrigerators, and the problem is—how to baptize the refrigerator?

It is always much easier to ask questions of this sort than to answer them. The Church of England tends to be almost morbidly self-critical at times, and many of its most enthusiastic members spend happy hours analysing the situation and tearing the Church to pieces, and then sit back feeling that they have accomplished something useful. What we have to do now is to make use of the analysis and see what it has to tell us about preaching the gospel to an affluent society. There can be no question of the message of the Church being fundamentally different from what it has been in the past, based as it is on the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Holy Spirit in the Church. What we need are new methods of presenting the doctrine that are in line with the changed state of our society.

In the first place there can be no doubt that our society is affluent. The report *The Family in Contemporary Society* gives the following figures—"The essentials of life, food, rent, light and fuel, and clothing, take only 60 per cent of the family budget; about fifty years ago 96 per cent of the family income went to meet these essential needs" (p. 98). In other words the average family to-day has 40 per cent of its income to spend on luxuries, whereas fifty years ago it had only 4 per cent left over from the basic needs of life. That in itself is a revolution within a lifetime, but figures published in the Press at the New Year looking back over the last decade show a startling increase in the country's general prosperity. Industrial production rose by 24 per cent; the labour force had increased by 1,500,000, mostly in the engineering, vehicle and distributive trades; wages outstripped the rise in prices; total exports rose to £3,500 million-worth in 1958 from £1,847 million-worth in 1949. On the personal level, the average annual income per head of the population rose from £220 in 1950 to £375 in 1959; expenditure on food nearly doubled; on radio and electrical goods it more than doubled, while on cars and cycles it was nine times greater. There were 4,900,000 cars on the roads in 1957 compared with 2,000,000 in 1950, while the 600,000

television licences in that year had become 9,900,000 in 1959 (figures are from *The Observer*, 3 January 1960).

It is almost true to say that the poor are no longer with us, and the Christian finds himself in a new situation. It used to be comparatively easy to go to the East End of London, or the slums of the big industrial cities, to do "good works"; but now the poor are out of sight, and possibly out of mind, in the Refugee Camps of Europe or the starvation areas of South-East Asia. The Church has not yet got a world-wide view of poverty, while at home it finds itself doing a large amount of social work by out-of-date methods with an organization geared to needs that are no longer there—so much youth work seems designed to meet the needs of "the lower orders", and the same might be said of many Sunday Schools. But apart from good works, it is very difficult for the Christian to attach any meaning to such words as "suffering" and "sacrifice". When your income is £1,000 a year how can you speak of "sacrificial" giving to someone living on the level of £20 a year? And how does one "suffer" in comfort?

It may be the first task of the Church simply to get people to accept the fact of our prosperity with all its privileges and responsibilities, and thank God for it. If we are really going to "baptize the refrigerator", there is no merit in throwing it away, for that would put the manufacturers out of business and cause unemployment. We must keep the refrigerator (and all the other products of affluence for which the refrigerator is but a symbol), and accept it as a gift to be used and enjoyed. One of the troubles with our society is that the affluence is so new, and we have not got used to it yet. It is sad to note the tone of regret with which Christians welcome the new prosperity—elderly clergymen speak wistfully of their youthful days when slums were really slums; and contemptuous references are so often made to the welfare state that it is quite evident that many people are unaware of the things that have come to pass—things for which our fathers fought all their lives. We must accept these things thankfully or otherwise we shall not recognize the responsibilities that go with them.

If the Church is going to take these responsibilities seriously there would seem to be a call for action on two levels—on the parochial and on the international levels. On the parochial level many schemes of Direct Giving show that parishes all over the country are beginning to take their responsibilities seriously, even if professional money-raisers have had to be employed to awaken the desire to give according to the means available. But even so, people are reluctant to admit that they are well off. High-pressure salesmanship and advertising combine to appeal to covetousness in all of us. The desire for the unpossessed afflicts people in every income group; it prevents people from realizing how well off they are; and they are prevented from exercising the stewardship of their wealth. The situation seems to call for a great extension of Direct Giving schemes. We must give the Church in an affluent society a recognized method of disgorging its own affluence. On the international level the Church

will be required to make political and economic judgments on a number of important issues, if it is to have any effect on the way the nation's wealth is to be spent. For example, we rightly give money for the relief of refugees and the alleviation of famine in Asia; but it is clear that the problems of the refugees and the starving can only be solved ultimately by large-scale investment in new industries in the affected areas, and this sort of thing requires political action. Giving to the poor is now a far more difficult problem than it has ever been before, and the Church ought not to rest content with its traditional forms of charitable relief.

We should now consider some particular effects of affluence on the society in which we live. One of the most noticeable effects in many urban parishes is that people stay at home much more than they used to do. Far more money is now being spent on household goods. Sales are reported to have risen considerably in the following items—furniture, carpets, electric fires, lawn-mowers, television sets, tape-recorders and film projectors. The result is that people stay at home to enjoy them, and pubs, cinemas and working men's clubs all show a big decline in attendances. The home is far more attractive for many people than it has ever been before. The housewife has less drudgery; the man of the house is happy to spend the evening in a comfortable armchair watching "telly", or else developing his creative instincts in many do-it-yourself schemes. His father or grandfather would have been only too glad to escape from the squalid overcrowded conditions of the home to the comparative comfort of the cinema or pub, where, particularly in the latter, he would have developed fairly wide social contacts. To-day it is possible that people are more unsociable than they have ever been before. This is probably only a temporary phase, and already young people are reacting from it, but it is one of the social pressures which the Church must take into account.

What should we be doing about it? One factor which should be considered very carefully is the television set, as a medium of mass communication. John Wesley used to hold mass meetings at which he used to preach to thousands at a time; not that he particularly valued a large audience for its size, but he knew the value of "preaching the Kingdom" as widely as possible, so that he could draw a few converts into the Methodist class meeting where the real life of his movement lay. Television would seem to be one way of preaching the Kingdom to a home-centred society, and any church which wanted to do evangelistic work in its parish ought at least to know what sort of religious ideas were percolating through to its would-be converts. The disadvantages of television are enormous; so many other educationalists and salesmen are using the same pipeline that there must be a good deal of unconscious resistance being built up in the minds of square-eyed viewers to the various opinions thrust at them. Yet the very diversity of the news coming through might be an advantage as well. All the important social and political issues which should concern Christians are covered from time to time—things like the treatment of crime and punishment, the death toll on

the roads, Apartheid in Africa and starvation in the Far East, are all presented in a reasonably objective fashion, and this makes a good starting point for discussing the Gospel in terms of modern life.

Finally some consideration must be given to the structure of the Church in the affluent society because in general the Church has failed to engage with the most typical members of this society, namely the technologist and the industrial worker. Yet anyone who has tried to explain the Christian religion to those outside the Church may understand what is meant by saying that the Trinity and the Incarnation are easy in comparison with the Holy Spirit in the Church. So often there is no human structure into which the potential convert can be brought and experience for himself the power of the Holy Spirit. Part of the reason for this is the inferior status accorded to the laity. "To go into the Church" means to become a clergyman, while the laity simply attend services. The result is the "double standard" to which Dr Warren referred in the January issue of THEOLOGY—heroic virtue for the few, humdrum morality for the many. It is extremely difficult for the layman to feel that he is really *in* the Church. It is hard enough for the stranger in many congregations to get to the stage of saying "Good Morning" to anyone. It is even more difficult for him to feel that he is part of a body of people committed to the task of redeeming the society in which they are living, and from which he can draw the strength that he needs for doing his share. This puts lay people at a great disadvantage, because in fact they are the front line troops when it comes to engaging with the modern affluent society. They often hold key positions in it and yet they only hold second-rate positions in the Church which is the agent of redemption.

It would seem that our ideal of the Church is wrong for dealing with this situation. We are not overburdened with large crowds in the Church of England, but all the time our ideal of the Church, expressed in the size of our buildings and our zeal for increasing numbers, is the large crowd. Yet this is not the ideal of the affluent society. Admittedly we all go off to Butlins for a fortnight together in the summer, but even this is the sort of crowd which encourages anonymity. The pattern of every-day living is against big crowds, and if, as we say, religion is concerned with every-day living, we must find means of engaging the every-day life of the affluent society. This will remain excessively difficult so long as the large crowd remains the ideal of the parish church, and so long as it is deemed "successful" or "unsuccessful" by whether or not it attains to this ideal. Surely the ideal of the Church to-day is to be found in small groups or cells which meet for study, prayer and discussion, and in which the laity can really know that they are *in* the Church. Many different attempts have been made in the last twenty years to establish cells within parishes. What is now needed is an attempt to make the small group the norm for church membership in the same way as John Wesley made the original Methodist class meeting the basis and the inspiration of Methodism. These class meetings gave

people a new quality of life at a time when the level of material comfort was not very high. Our own affluent society is already showing signs of needing a new quality of life. If there is any real poverty in England to-day, it is the poverty of living, expressed in neurosis, loneliness and the disappointment in life which appears to be so prevalent. If the Church is to be the agent of redemption for the affluent society, it must first show the individual that a new quality of life can be found in the local church, and then turn boldly to face the fact that the whole world must also become affluent in the fullest sense of the word.

G. H. Babington.

The Single Eye

Amongst the words of Jesus is the saying: "The light (or lamp) of the body is the eye: If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light." The eye seems to be regarded as the organ which illuminates the dark interior of the body, the lamp that lights it or the window by which the light can enter. But the saying is not directed to define this conception, whatever precisely it may have been, and we need not pay regard to this aspect of its image. Its point is rather the quality the eye must possess if it is to enlighten. It must be single, simple. If, the saying continues, your eye is evil, its quality not this singleness but duplicity, you will be filled, not with light, but with darkness. The eye on which we are bidden to reflect is the mind's eye, the mind's apprehension. If this be single, simple, the mind will receive the light.

Yet the physical image, the body and its eye, remains apt; more apt to its purpose than any one of the more specialized substitutes—intellectual, aesthetic, practical—into which we may from time to time translate it; for the quality of singleness or simplicity to which the saying draws our attention is a quality of the person, and its acquisition or loss will make or mar any and every one of the person's more specialized activities, his thought, or his admiration, or his practice.

The saying, so taken, directs our attention to two things: to the importance of knowing the truth, or indeed of recognizing what *is*, whatever be the aspect of what is with which from time to time we are specially concerned, and to the way in which that is achieved—or perhaps we should say to the essential precondition without which it will not be achieved. More attention is commonly given to the first, to the importance of finding the truth, than to the second, the way by which we are likely to find it. But first things are first; and I suggest that it is the acquiring of the single eye, rather than what will then be disclosed to it, that first and most chiefly concerns us. What will be disclosed we cannot foretell; but we can be sure that if our eye be not single it will not be the truth. Moreover, the single eye, the direct and frank vision, though hard to acquire, and

still harder to preserve as the directness yet inexperience of childhood give place to the complexities and sophistications of later years, can yet in some measure be ours if we will, as the truth cannot always.

The saying is characteristic of the sayings of Jesus just in this, that it puts what for us is the first thing first. It is so with many of his sayings. The way to look is given priority over the thing then seen; the right question over the answer; the motive over the consequence; the quality of character over the rule of conduct. It is because his sayings had that originality and penetration, brief though they are, and because they found expression in concrete images which do not lose their impact, rather than as abstract formulations which, as contexts change, tend to lose their relevance, that they have endured and have not, like so much teaching, passed long since into oblivion.

What, then, is this single eye, this quality of singleness or sincerity of mind, which, our saying asserts, is the precondition of the mind's illumination, of the light within? Let us look briefly at two of its manifestations, and then, still briefly, at a third which perhaps concerns us most

First in scholarship. And I am not thinking of the qualities demanded of the student of letters rather than of the student of the sciences; for scholarship, in its essential character, is the same for both. It consists in attention to the evidence; keen, curious, discriminating, sensitive, but above all sincere in the sense that it is permitted to make its impression; and in the drawing of the conclusions, or the making of the generalizations, which that evidence, and not some other consideration, requires or invites. No doubt it involves much more, when at its best. It needs a wide background of comparative knowledge, to be gained only by time and labour; though that is itself the process of seeing the evidence more completely and distinguishing what is relevant from what is not. It demands also imagination; though that too is the gift of using evidence to the full and of noticing what the less inventive mind would never see. But the first condition is the single eye, that sincerity of vision, which looks in order to see, to see what it is that is there to be seen. Ignorance, at every stage, is in some degree inevitable, and it makes some errors unavoidable. But the commonest errors, and those least likely to supply their own correctives, are not the consequences of ignorance, but of the lack of singleness of mind—of prejudice, of the desire to maintain an opinion, to refute another opinion, to save ourselves trouble, or to prove ourselves right. And for these there is only one cure: the single eye.

But let us not suppose that the disinterestedness of the single eye is an absence of interest. It is the absence only of the irrelevant interest, of prejudice. There is no seeing without interest. Recall how surprisingly the power to discriminate, for example, between fine shades of colour, or between other sensible qualities, of touch or taste or hearing, arises when interest is focussed upon the discrimination. The blind man distinguishes sounds that the seeing

man does not hear. The single eye has this penetration of vision because its interest is to see—to see what it is that is there to be seen. This is the scholar's eye. And because his desire is to see, he is fearless what he sees. This is the eye that, if we have it, lights the mind. We may liken this sincerity of vision, this combination of openness and directness, to another of our senses: not now to the seeing eye, but to the listening ear. The comparison has in one respect a peculiar appositeness; for in listening intently, especially near the threshold of sensitivity, we are peculiarly conscious of the objective interest, the interest in discriminating with precision what is really to be heard. The comparison emphasizes also another feature of genuine apprehension: to listen, *we* must be silent. So it is with the mind's sincerity.

Let us recall too that though the single eye is always indispensable, it is manifested in many ways. There are some things best seen when the emotions are still; but there are others not seen at all without passionate feeling. Both may exhibit, the second, it may be, yet more finely than the first, that intense sincerity which is the light of the soul.

If true scholarship is one manifestation of the single eye, true craftsmanship of hand is another. The ability to use a fine tool so that its specialized adaptations wonderfully enhance the dexterity of hand, and to work a fine material so that, as the craftsman works it, it develops its own potentialities till it assumes the form he gives it, may be displayed by those to whom the opportunity of scholarship in its academic sense has never come; but it has the same distinction. It is the scholarship of the hand. And it demands comparable qualities of mind: the same sincerity, the same intense and disinterested preoccupation with its object. There is a respect, a reverence, of the craftsman for his material like the scholar's for his evidence. Both require the single eye, that sincerity of mind which is the virtue of virtues and the precondition of all valuable attainment.

If this sincerity of vision is the prerequisite alike of the thinker and of the craftsman, it is also the first requirement, the one thing needful, in the religious man. Without this virtue of sincerity, the penetrating sincerity to ask and look, so hard to possess, yet demanding so little of specialized ability or accomplishment, there is no *reverence*, no recognition of the *sacred*, of the binding obligation, of the unconditional worth, and so no worship of God. This is the pass-key to the kingdom of heaven, without which no man can enter. But let us recognize—it is the converse of the same truth—that if he can acquire it, it is then not for any other man to prejudge what he will find within. Religion does not require of us acceptance of conclusions we have not tested. It imposes no obligatory doctrines. Its invitation is that of Philip: "Come and see." But it makes one demand, that we have this sincerity, this directness, of heart, without which, by the nature of the case, there cannot be that unconditional devotion, that unreserved, that absolute reverence, that vision, albeit of an object yet ever beyond our sight, in which religion consists.

There is another saying of Jesus', still better known than that with which I began. "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Is the saying hard? But is a saying hard because it calls attention to what is true by the nature of the case, to a condition that is an intrinsic, essential condition? And is it not in another sense easy? Whom does the condition exclude? No class or category by reason of privilege or accidental disqualification, whether of performance or of attainment. The yoke may yet be easy and the burden light.

This second saying also is apposite in its analogy. The vision of the child, partly indeed by reason of its very limitations, has a quality that in later years it is hard to retain, yet one we should strive never to lose. William Henry Hudson, recalling as few can his own boyhood, then already "far away and long ago", tells how "When, riding on the plain, I discovered a patch of scarlet verbenas in full bloom, the creeping plants covering an area of several yards with a moist, green sward sprinkled abundantly with the shining flower-bosses, I would throw myself from my pony with a cry of joy to lie and feast my sight on their brilliant colour". There is the child's vision: absorbed, intense, uninhibited, objective, its object sharply discriminated, individual, self-contained, all-powerfully vivid. As the years pass, such vision, once possessed, though then no doubt restricted in its reference mainly to the actually sensible, tends to be lost. "We look before and after"and live no more in the wonder, or it may be the terror, of the moment. Especially, we concern ourselves with the general and regard the particular as but its instance. This is indeed inevitable, and in its positive aspect it is the proper fruit of experience and education, extending the world without limit in time and space, endowing it with variety and complexity beyond comprehension, and enriching it with that further dimension of imaginative construction which fills so much of the well-furnished mind and in which art and poetry so largely consist. Yet it is not impossible, and it should be our primary task, to preserve in these enlarged conditions the directness, the sincerity, the singleness of the child's vision, without which honest purpose is lost, life's freshness fades, and the gate of heaven closes. Only as we preserve it do we have reverence, do we have humility, do we have the vision that is fearless as well as keen; for without it we no longer recognize what makes the unconditional demand and so evokes the unreserved response. There is a third saying, difficult, I think, to distinguish in its essential meaning from the two I have already quoted, which tells us "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God".

Let me emphasize one thing in conclusion. It should be the theologian's criterion. It is sometimes asserted, at least it seems often implied, that God's revelation and his grace are exceptions to the principle I have ventured to affirm. Are they not just the means whereby God gains the victory *in spite* of the absence in man of the single eye? If not, would not man be without a deliverer other than himself, and the claim of religion be void? I am sure that we must

reject that view. It is opposed to the true religious need, and it is unintelligible. We have but to ask ourselves *what it is* that we suppose revelation to disclose and *what it is* that grace confers. Are they something that can be apprehended except by the single eye, or received except by the sincere mind? To assert it would be to seek what religion bids us not seek, because it is neither the soul's need nor the soul's true desire. We have no reason to limit what God may disclose or what he may bestow. But we have the best reason for asserting that the power of God and the grace of God—and if God indeed be God are they not one and the same?—operate by evoking what alone can apprehend and be moved by them. "If" —and we must add only if—"thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light."

J. S. Boys Smith.

Yet More About Parables

"'Like the churches,' writes the local secretary of the Workers' Educational Association, 'we are constantly discussing the situation of apathy which confronts us to-day, though we haven't any answer to it. But we are all in it together.' Yes, and in it with us are the trade union leaders, the party politicians, and the revolutionaries as well. All of us are searching for the right method of communication to carry the faiths for which we stand to the great mass of industrial workers in such a way as to win from them an imaginative response. So far none of us has found it. To say that there is no way is to accuse the majority of our fellow citizens of having ceased to be human. Their imaginations are still there to be kindled, their loyalties still there to be won . . . But—to write now only from the point of view of the Church—there is a deeper and a prior truth to be communicated than the truth of what is satisfying in active church membership. This is the fact, the relevance, the importance, and the beauty of the underlying spiritual order which surrounds and gives meaning to the whole of our lives. At bottom we are immortal spirits, even when we are working in the mass production factory in Trafford Park, and our real life is a spiritual and indestructible life. Until we have got this sense across we cannot hope to get its practical corollaries like sacraments or moralities accepted."

(*Manchester Guardian*, 26 April 1956.)

Thus Canon Roger Lloyd poses the current "problem of communication". In "On the Gentiles also?" (Theology, July 1951) I sought so to describe a young mechanic's Saturday afternoon watching football and Saturday evening at the dance hall as to demonstrate that "in Spirit and in truth the Cross of Jesus goeth on before in Joe's world of popsies, pictures and pools"; and that, by implication, this "problem of communication" is basically a problem of opening the eyes of those blind to the God who is already active and present in their lives. In "Tamar and Mrs Thomas" (Theology,

December 1952) I applied this not startlingly original approach to the daily life of the housewife, and added the conviction that "telling stories, describing situations and events is a proper theological method, perhaps ultimately the proper theological method . . . Jeremiah's old woman broke a pot when washing up. Instead of (or as well as) cursing her . . . he saw in a flash—that's what God will do to Jerusalem. And he went out and acted his parable. And so must we, if we are to bring Mrs Thomas and thousands like her to conscious conviction of the purpose and presence of God. The kingdom of heaven is like a man playing football, a girl buying a new mac; like going overseas on national service, like opening the office window and letting the fresh air in . . ."

This latter point of the urgent relevance of the parabolic method to the "problem of communication" was further defined and developed in "The Power of Jesus is like" (THEOLOGY, February 1954). I now seek, as it were, a closer refinement of the two terms of effective parabolic communication. In other words what is the basic gospel that we are to communicate? And what are the universal, or at least widespread human experiences in whose terms we are to communicate it? Of course no such inquiry, especially if brief, can claim to do any more than stimulate further thinking on a subject that embraces on the one hand the width of human experience and on the other "the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. 3. 8).

To Nicodemus, Jesus said: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3. 16). To the woman of Samaria he proclaimed: : "I that speak unto thee am he" (John 4. 26). The first epistle of John remains the most effective commentary on the Fourth Gospel. "Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him" (1 John 4. 9). The basic sequence of the gospel is this. The Father loves us. He sends his Son to us. We live through him. To this we must add: We present this new life to others. "And we have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world" (1 John 4. 14).

The Son's claim to be "Messiah . . . (which is called Christ)" (John 4. 25) is to be interpreted in terms which he himself set by word and action. "The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he shall rise again" (Mark 9. 31). God the Father has, as it were, anchored the spiritual mission of the Son to be the Saviour of the world in the historical, material facts of the Cross and the Resurrection. The Cross and the Resurrection are the two foci round which the encompassing ellipse of the mission of the Incarnate Son is orientated. The apostle Paul is insistent on the material, historical facts. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures; and that he appeared . . ." (1 Cor. 15. 3–5). He also records the transfiguring and penetrating effect of this

death and rising again on the individual believer. "I have been crucified with Christ yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God who loved me, and gave himself up for me" (Gal. 2. 20). Or, as another writer puts it: "Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed" (1 Peter 2. 24).

Inadequate as they are, these few quotations may serve to fix a pattern of the gospel for our consideration; the death and new life of Christ Jesus our Lord; and the recapitulation of that death and new life in those who believe the gospel. But to say that is of course hardly to begin to communicate that gospel to "Joe's world of popsies, pictures and pools". In that world such words as sin, righteousness, incarnate, resurrection will be virtually meaningless. The pattern of death and new life must be interpreted in terms of the experience of those who live in this world. "God so loved the world." In order that we too may love, we must get to know. In order that we may get to know, we must meet.

One obvious place of meeting which is rightly much canvassed these days is the place of work. Writing some time ago in the magazine of King's College, London, J. B. W. introduced three "Parables in Overalls" in these words: "These are couched in the technical language that any engineer who has served an apprenticeship would understand. To him the words in inverted commas are thus unnecessarily adorned. This is not even slang; it is his own speech which he has been taught to use. For this reason of course these stories could only be addressed to men thus trained. But would it not be possible to relate them to others in a slightly different guise—in smocks, or oil-skins—bell-bottoms or battle-dress?"

Of the "Parables in Overalls" which follow, "A Batch of Ten Cylinder Liners" is the shortest: "The operator of a vertical boring machine has a batch of ten cylinder liners to machine. Which of these will he enjoy doing the most? Those which are good castings with 'plenty of metal on'—or the odd one which is a bit warped, but which by careful 'setting up' he can 'bring in' and save? Which one will he tell his mates about?"

The other two parables appear to be equally loyal both to the technical language of the workshop and to the form and teaching of individual parables of Jesus. In these loyalties lie their virtues, but also, in my opinion, their limitations. For rather than a "translation" of our Lord's parables into an industrial idiom, what is really required is to convey direct in terms of a man's (or a woman's) work this pattern of death unto sin and new life unto righteousness which the death and rising again of Jesus Christ effect in those who believe.

It is at this point that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is clearly relevant. Bread and wine, effective symbols of the everyday world of daily work for daily food are here penetrated and transfigured by the eternal Spirit of God. As against the hammer and sickle, the

Communists' effective and indeed inspiring symbols of man's industry and agriculture, his daily work for daily bread, we set forth profounder signs, the broken bread and the poured out wine of the Holy Eucharist. These are effective signs of God's material gifts of corn and grape; of man's labour, enhancing their value, changing them into bread and wine; and finally of the presence of the Spirit of the Risen Christ, sanctifying, penetrating, transfiguring, so that the body of Christ, broken in death, and the blood of Christ, poured out in death convey new life to those who receive them by faith with thanksgiving.

But Canon Lloyd has warned us that until we have got across the sense of "the underlying spiritual order", "we cannot hope to get its practical corollaries like sacraments or moralities accepted". If we are to "convey direct . . . the pattern of death unto sin and new life unto righteousness which the death and rising again of Jesus Christ effect in those who believe", two principles now suggest themselves. The first is that the spoken rather than the written or printed word may prove itself a more fundamental means of communication. The second is that there are even more basic realms of human experience than daily work. We have all heard of the "four-wheeler Christians" who come to church in their prams to be baptized, in taxis to be married, and in hearses to be buried. Very many of course don't even do that. But here at least are three focal points of birth, marriage and death at which the church already has widespread opportunities to present the gospel. Is it then at these points that we may most effectively communicate the pattern of death and new life in Christ Jesus? Let me in conclusion attempt illustrations of how a man might parabolically communicate Christ in terms of the basic human experiences of birth, marriage and death in turn.

"You know all this talk about smoking and lung cancer. I was reading an article in the paper by a chap whose doctor told him he must give up smoking. You might be interested. Here it is:

" 'At length my mind was made up. No tapering off, but a clean cut. At the beginning of April I gave away my cigarette-case and lighter, and burned my pipes, all except two old companions which I carefully broke and buried near the raspberry canes. It was like the death of a dog. To start again would at last require new equipment.

" 'The struggle? There was one, of course, but looking back it wasn't so bad. Curious that; my wife once said the same of childbirth. By the end of May it was clear the battle was over, and although the anniversary marks the day I chucked smoking for good, it isn't a victory of the will I want to celebrate.

" '. . . Playing tennis one evening I happened to scratch my nose with a ball in my hand. It was a new ball, and smelt delicious. I paused to rub it against my nostrils, rather surprised to find it so good. Then it dawned on me. I hadn't smelt a tennis ball for years.

" 'Gradually, after a break of some fifteen years, I began again to scent the world. It didn't come back all at once. First obvious smells sharpened their edges. Mint, coffee, petrol, tar, disinfectants, bacon

and kippers . . . Then there were smells I had not been consciously aware of before; unmade beds; the dry aroma of pyjamas warm from the airing cupboard; the resinous sharpness of pine trees; sawdust; cold stone; chairs just vacated; the subtle sweetness of a woman's workbox . . .' " (From the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, 12 April 1956.)

Now what struck me right at the start was this chap's comparison of giving up smoking with what his wife had said about childbirth. Jesus said: "A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow because her hour is come: but when she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for the joy that a man is born into the world. And ye therefore now have sorrow: but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no one taketh away from you" (John 16. 21. 22). This chap's experience of giving up smoking and regaining his sense of smell is quite a parable of the sorrow and joy of being a Christian. Like the death of a dog? Your pet faults and failings and mine have to be rooted out. No tapering off but a clean cut. And it's a struggle all right—for the will most of all. It may be like grim death. But gradually or suddenly things change. As that chap's sense of smell was restored to him, so a Christian who is born anew, begins to see everything in a new light. It's a wonderful restoration this; and a whole new range of experience opens out too, just as that chap found a whole range of smells he had never noticed before. Of course the struggle continues too, even intensifies. But, oh, it's different, this new life:

> O burn that searest never!
> O wound of deep delight!
> O gentle hand! O touch of love supernal
> That quick'nest life for ever,
> Putt'st all my woes to flight,
> And, slaying, changest death to life eternal!
>
> (St John of the Cross: Tr. E. A. Peers.)

Have we forgotten to whom we are talking? The world does not care for mystical poetry. Or does it? When in battle-dress, the world exhibited an unexpected passion for string quartets. "At bottom we are immortal spirits, even when we are working in the mass production factory in Trafford Park, and our real life is a spiritual and indestructible life." But let us try again (marriage, this time):

"Of course being a Christian doesn't just mean giving up things, beer, smoking, dogs, pools, whatever you think that Christ would call wasteful or stupid or wrong. But there does seem usually to be some giving up, some sacrifice, involved in it all right. A friend of mine at college got married, when we were there, to a most attractive girl. I remember his telling me that, when he got engaged, he felt he had to tear up the photos of all his girl friends. I got the impression that they had been rather numerous! It must have been a bit of a wrench, but he felt it was the right thing to do. And it was worth it every time! He was one of those enthusiasts who go round pitying all their friends who are not yet married!

"It can be something like that when a man or woman accepts Christ as their Master and Friend. They have to tear up their past and start afresh. This may cost a good deal. But afterwards . . . Someone has put it like this:

To those who fall, how kind thou art,
How good to those who seek!

But what to those who find? Ah! this
Nor tongue nor pen can show;
The love of Jesus, what it is
None but his loved ones know.

Jesus, our only joy be thou,
As thou our prize wilt be;
Jesus, be thou our glory now,
And through eternity."

(12th century: Tr. E. Caswall.)

Does the world care for this kind of verse? Perhaps not. But "their imaginations are still there to be kindled, their loyalties still there to be won". We have risked the poetry in speaking to the human experience of "repentance" in the contexts of birth and marriage. As we approach the theme of death, let us be more matter-of-fact if we can.

"During the war I did a daft thing. I trod on a mine. Maybe I was lucky. It only blew part of my foot off. But the blood started to flow pretty fast. I swore like a trooper. And for a split second of panic I thought I was going to die. Then I managed to get out my field dressing and stop the worst of the flow. It wasn't long before I was picked up, but it took the stretcher-bearers two hours to get me down that hill—in full view of the enemy all the way. You can imagine I was feeling pretty sick, shaken and sorry for myself when I got to the medical aid post. I just couldn't stop shivering, although I tried hard enough.

"The doctor, a New Zealander, was a cheery cove. 'H'm,' he said. 'It looks as if you've lost a good pint of blood. If I give you two pints, do you think that would do?' I thought that it might. Soon the blood transfusion was in full flood. And as someone else's blood, freely given for this very purpose, began to flow into my veins, I began to feel fine. I knew that I was going to live. Indeed, I knew that I was going to play cricket again, and ramble over the moors. As a matter of fact, that blood transfusion was rather like getting a steak and chips and a quart of beer inside you after a twenty mile hike. Better than that; whereas I had felt sick, shivery and shaken, I now felt cheery and confident. Nor was it just a matter of feelings. I didn't merely feel better. I was better. It was the turning point of my progress back to health.

"You know, we Christian believers sometimes speak and sing about the blood of Jesus. What is more, we spiritually drink the blood of Jesus at the Holy Communion. Jesus said: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in yourselves.

He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him' " (John 6. 53–56).

Now it is further recorded: "Many therefore of his disciples, when they heard this, said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (John 6. 60). But I think that it is like that blood transfusion. In real life, as in the Bible, the shedding of blood is an all too effective sign of death; the possession or imparting of blood, an equally effective sign of life. We say that the Son of God shed his blood upon the Cross for us men and for our salvation, our eternal health. To receive that blood spiritually into our hearts and souls is not so much to feel better, as to be better; to be right with God. Our world is sick and sorry, shivering on the brink of unimaginable horrors. And you . . . ?

> Just as I am, without one plea
> But that thy blood was shed for me,
> And that thou bidd'st me come to thee,
> O Lamb of God, I come.

This last illustration at least derives from personal experience. It is, as it were, the best that I can do by way of communication. But is it good enough? Can we who look to the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* for illustrations effectively communicate the gospel to "Joe's world of popsies, pictures and pools"? Or is a more drastic discipline of identification necessary?

A. H. Dammers.

The Ministry of Women

It is unfortunate that at a period in the life of the Church of England when enlightened and bold advances are being made on all sides in the sphere of preaching, pastoralia, study and organization, the ministry of women should be lamentably neglected and misunderstood by a majority in the Church, both clerical and lay. Nor are the women themselves particularly vocal about it. One cannot but admire their self-restraint and self-imposed restrictions upon anything remotely suggesting a movement of clerical suffragettes. Certain leading women in the Church have played and are playing a quiet and very effective role as "educators", and a few bishops and priests are supporting them. There are those who have a deep intuitive sense that the priesthood is not for women, but by and large the whole question of a proper ministry for women in the Church is simply being shelved in the pious hope that sooner or later the "urge" will die down. This is an absurd attitude: it is ostrich-like, and ignores the age in which we live. Both the catholicism and protestantism of to-day have upon them the marks of the Renais-

sance, and many would find in these marks the hint of a Church more recognizably "without spot or wrinkle" than the medieval model. The Christian Faith to-day must find life and form in a Church which, when viewed by history, will give an impression of greater nearness to Christ than the earlier models.

The object of this article is not simply to make facile generalizations about history, but to ventilate an approach to the ministry of women which does not seem to have received sufficient attention. What many would call the psychology of our attitude to the ministry of women in England to-day seems to fall under three heads: the natural conservatism of the country and of the Church of England; the ebullient pride of the male in the human species; and a genuine concern for reunion with catholic orthodoxy. There is little to say under the first heading (apart from the theology of ordaining women referred to later) which has not already been said very effectively by the *avant garde* members of the medical profession, the legal profession, and the ancient universities, in the early days of the entry of women into those professional fields. The arguments can be studied in the archives of the respective journals and do not need repeating. This same kind of study will help to clear away some of the difficulties surrounding hindrance number two—the ebullient male! A flushed member of an ancient "club" rushes to the writing table and reaches for his pen when he thinks of a woman bishop, and collapses with apoplexy at the thought of a woman general, forgetting all about Joan of Arc and Deborah and the hagiology of the Christian Church. Reasonable judgment agrees with a speaker in the House of Laity recently that there are not "an enormous number of women who are dying to dress themselves up in surplices", and one suspects that the opening of the priesthood to women would not greatly alter the character of the Church of England. There would be differences in certain parishes, at least outwardly, with a woman head, but again reasonable realism, as well as a slightly humourous curl to the lip, can hardly deny that many parishes have been, and are being, very effectively guided and taught by women. The case so often propounded of the married woman priest coping with home duties, child-bearing, sickness, etc., and consequently hindered from exercising priestly duties, is not really any more of a problem than it would be for the woman doctor or lawyer, and where there is a partner the burden can be shared. It is the third head—the genuine concern for reunion—which is the chief stumbling block in the minds of many. Here perhaps the approach to our thinking should be altered. We are rather inclined to think of the Roman Church as similar in shape to our own Church of England. We share a common catholicism but not a common approach to leadership and discipline. The Roman Church is a *bachelor-spinster* church, and at every point where the ministry of women causes apparent embarrassment in the Church of England it is exercised in reasonably satisfactory working conditions in the Church of Rome. Generally speaking, because of celibate leadership, there is not a wide difference of opportunity for men and women;

young men and women in the teens and twenties go forward with courage and conviction to their priestly and lay service; they are willing to be sent where the Church directs and they know that they will find scope for the exercise of leadership in the spheres of community life, diocese, and parish. It is quite customary for women to lead services and give addresses in their various convents, cures and parishes, and the only people who conceivably might be surprised would be some of the protestant brethren! The question of the ordination of women to the priesthood could never "mean" as much to the Roman community because service is freely available to both men and women. But who is to say that the quite obvious influences of the Reformation, the open Bible, the Protestant bodies, the Ecumenical Movement, upon the Church of Rome will not become considerable during the present and succeeding centuries? History may yet witness another *volte face* even more startling than that which reversed the ruling about Evening Mass. After all, the Church of Rome is not foolish, particularly in matters which concern the masses of the people, and if there is a Church which values what the Holy Spirit is saying in history (A.D.) over against what is written in the Word of God, it surely is the Roman Church. And if the Free Churches are in some cases finding their way round the literal Word of God over the question of the Ministry of Women, Catholicism may yet see through the blinding power of Church Tradition. In the Church of England the problem is a little different because we have to visualize a married clergy undertaking the leadership of some four-fifths of the Church's work and worship. It seems odd that this should affect the issue of the ministry of women, but in fact it does, and for a reason which ethical students might diagnose as not altogether unconnected with jealousy. It is not the direct jealousy of a priest and his wife for the successful ministry of some other man or woman, but that subterranean thing, the jealousy of the Church concerning the possible extension and expansion of Christ's work along hitherto unusual and unconventional lines. The banging of the big drum of conventional behaviour draws a very happy "crowd" in our church, as in most churches! There is really no reason at all why a woman, single or married, should not be capable of running a parish as efficiently as a man. The fact that great numbers may not be immediately or ultimately willing to do so does not make it wrong for those who feel it to be their vocation.

Theologically the problem comes down fundamentally to the simple question of whether a woman is capable of receiving Holy Orders. "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The words of the bishop as he lays his hands upon the head of the man to be ordained priest imply a belief in the capability of the man to receive the Holy Order; they also imply his ability to speak

the words of Christ in forgiveness where it is sought in penitence, and they imply that the deacon being presented for priesting is a fit person to dispense the Word of God and his Holy Sacraments. Given a holy and good life as the necessary prerequisite, is it possible to say that a woman is incapable of receiving the Holy Order of Priesthood? Differences between men and women are all complementary in nature. It would be hazardous to claim some biological or mental impediment. Such a claim would run clean contrary to nature, science, and the doctrine of man as clearly taught by Christ. Our Lord did not choose women amongst His twelve disciples because to do so would have been impossible in his day. "A Jew thanked God daily that he was not born a woman, and the rabbis used to debate whether women had souls. Women had almost no civil rights (e.g. in the matter of divorce) and took almost no part in religious ceremonies; in the Temple they were not allowed beyond the Court of Women." Dr Richardson is commenting on chapter four in St John's Gospel and he reminds his readers "of the magnitude of the conversion which had been wrought in the heart of a pupil of Gamaliel's who could actually write that 'in Christ there can be neither male nor female'" (Gal. 3. 28). Many women were amongst the Lord's most faithful followers, and St Luke records many stories of their corporate ministry. And we have moved a long way on since then. To-day the theological departments of our universities are full to overflowing with women—many of them have been heads of their schools—and yet the field of service in the Church is very limited indeed; limited in scope, opportunity, finance, support, and in the understanding and enthusiasm of Church leaders. Pastorally, holy women in the Church have been the confidants of many down the ages, and heard many confessions, and pronounced many words of comfort where they were needed. Do we not teach that, apart from the ghostly words of counsel given by the priest, the words of absolution spoken by him are simply audible words which he repeats? It is God who uses them and makes them the words of Christ in forgiveness. If a man can be used for this work by God, why is it so impossible for a woman to be so used? What about the dispensing of the Sacraments? Is the catholic doctrine of the real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist likely to be hindered in any way if the priest is a woman? If she is properly ordained, after due training, and if the intention on her part and on the Church's part is that she should be a "priest in the Church of God", then surely the rest follows. Christ commissioned men. The Church of Christ may be led by the Holy Ghost to commission men and women. The essence of the priestly life is the work of reconciling souls to God; leading the local community in the worship of God; and sustaining them in the new life in Christ by the grace of the Holy Spirit. It would appear to be true that God is calling women into this ministry in the twentieth century.

The way forward may be by way of lay-readership. Women talking in church, or even preaching (in spite of St Paul) do not cause quite such an emotional upheaval as the thought of full-time women

priests. *The Church Times* on 6 February 1959 commented favourably on the House of Laity's vote for the admission of women as lay-readers, and pointed out that "the principle of allowing women to read Morning and Evening Prayer, and give addresses other than at the Holy Communion, has already been conceded with regard to deaconesses. Churchwardens (who may be women) have the legal right in certain circumstances to read Morning and Evening Prayer in church. In the mission field (and in Roman Catholic churches in France, for that matter) it is common to find women playing a considerable part in public worship." There are plenty of difficulties, plenty of strong emotions, and plenty of problems to be solved, but the time is fast approaching when the ministry of women should be treated as a serious subject for study and discussion, and not dismissed with a shrug as an absurd notion. Is there such need for the Church of England to be so *very* cautious in this matter? The theological problems attaching to the ordination of women seem, on any showing, to be far more tractable than those dividing the Churches over the Eucharist.

Luce Magistra.

The Burial of Infants

The undertaker rings me up and says that a week-old infant has died in Camford hospital; the mother, whom I visit forthwith, explains the medical details quite calmly, though she is naturally under shock. She speaks of the possibility of adopting a baby later, when they have had time to get over their sorrow, and can think more clearly. I, knowing the admirable lady in charge of Diocesan Moral Welfare, support this idea as definitely as I can without pushing too hard in the immediate circumstances. Later, over the practical details of the funeral, I have a similar talk with her husband, who is also much affected by the child's death, and also concerned about the shock to his wife. I give them a brief blessing, and though so far as I know they are non-practising C. of E., I feel that this is not the time for a discussion on innocent suffering, even if I could know enough to be cogent about it. I feel with the parents, that it is hard that some couples who do not really want children have strong and healthy babies, while others, sometimes for reasons which cannot be cured, long for a family which is not possible.

In due course the child is buried in the churchyard, with the use of the 1928 Prayer Book. I have omitted to ask whether the child was baptized in hospital, because if it was not, the mother may be distressed at the possible implication that it ought to have been. I use the first form of Committal, which speaks of "sure and certain hope of the Resurrection", though there is some doubt in my mind when I think this over later.

I look up "limbo" in the concise Oxford Dictionary, and find a

somewhat chilling definition—"region on the border of hell where pre-Christian just men and unbaptized infants are confined". Extending my reading to Hall's Theological Outlines, I read of Limbus Puerorum, hypothecated to avoid the supposition, not found in Scripture, that all who miss the Christian Covenant in this life are to be everlastingly punished in hell. I find references to St Thomas's Summa and the Catholic Encyclopedia which are not available to me.

Thinking this over, there seems a need for a more positive hope for the innocent outside the Covenant. An embryonic human soul is not like an animal, which logically has no soul and no mind, reluctantly though I make this supposition as a lover of animals. It does not seem enough that a child should be on the edge of hell, and possibly on the edge of heaven. My heart as well as my mind rebels against neatly labelled regions, and I am not fully informed by Scripture about conditions in eternity. "Suffer the little children to come unto me" seems a satisfactory lesson in the 1928 Burial Service, with its positive hope, and lack of definition as to what "to me" really means.

As a pastor I am sure that, baptized or not, an infant can be taken direct to the graveside, when only one or two mourners are concerned. The professional funeral-enjoyers like a church service, and insinuate that to deprive an innocent child of benefit of Church, is not meeting the situation. It seems common kindness to reduce the severe tension of the parents by taking the brief service at the graveside, and reducing the number of sentimental lookers-on.

This is a difficult moment, this return from the graveside. I must not "make conversation". It is not the moment for a little homily (though some priests I know could do this naturally and helpfully). We have already discussed the possibilities for the future. Clichés about the healing power of time will serve for a group of people who have lost an adult relative, and are grateful for some indication that their parson understands what they are suffering. Silent intercession is a great deal, but a word is needed. If I say that the child has gone to the love of God, they may not take it in, but at least it is true. I must go and visit them again soon, and I shall find something to say then; indeed, they will probably provide the right opening, and I must be ready to take it.

K. F. Rogers.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. H. Babington is Priest-in-charge of William Temple Church, Sheffield.

The Rev. J. S. Boys Smith is Master of St John's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. A. H. Dammers is Vicar of Holy Trinity, Millhouses, Sheffield.

"Luce Magistra" is the *nom de plume* of a parish priest of 25 years' experience, now a school chaplain and itinerant spiritual director.

The Rev. K. F. Rogers is Rector of Rodborough, Stroud.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

LATTER-DAY SAINTS AND CHRISTIANS

Dear Sir,

I feel that the timely article on the Mormons in your May number should be followed by a reminder that some of us working in new communities are offended as much by their missionary *methods* as by the actual content of their teaching. The following may be taken as words of warning:

(*a*) Their doorstep introduction is extremely vague, e.g. "We're from the church". Only when they have got inside, offered up their conditioning extempore prayer and seated themselves on the settee does it gradually materialize that they are not from St So and So's round the corner.

(*b*) Practising Christians should be told to be quite firm with them on the first occasion unless they want to be troubled time and time again. Taking "no" for an answer is not a Mormon strong point.

(*c*) Whilst it is true that "their mission work is almost entirely among Christians", the majority of the latter are extremely nominal and almost totally incapable of answering the superficially very impressive black-and-white-but-no-grey arguments of the Mormons who, we are constantly informed, really do "know" their Bible. The verbal bamboozling and cross-questioning of the near ignorant by two meaty we've-got-it-all-off-pat-between-us Americans surely verges on religious brain washing.

(*d*) Our more intelligent Christians would be ill advised to try playing textual table tennis; playing against trained devotees of the game they will nearly always lose. But they should at the same time be taught the true and thoughtful approach to the Bible as opposed to a mechanical all on the same level literalism.

(*e*) In places where Mormons are operating, a notice in the parish magazine, and perhaps the local paper, should make it plain that Mormons are *not* one of the recognized branches of the Christian Church. "We're all the same really, Vicar, aren't we?" can be taken a bit too far!

Yours faithfully,
Derek W. Price.

St Mary's House,
Stevenage.

THE BISHOP'S DISCRETION

DEAR SIR,

I wonder whether "The Bishop's Discretion" is really the best means of settling the difficult problem of a request for readmittance to Holy Communion by a divorced person who remarries.

I have recently been trying to help a young divorcée who moved to another part of the country when she married again. Her new husband was a Methodist. She went to her parish priest to explain her case, which was duly referred to the Bishop. The decision came back that she was to attend Holy Communion for a year without receiving the Sacrament. This she began to do, realizing that some form of discipline was essential. But she found it hard to avoid a growing sense of bitterness, as Sunday by Sunday she heard the invitation to repent (which she had accepted) and to take the Sacrament (which she could not accept), followed by the Comfortable Words which came to be cold comfort to her.

However, some months afterwards her husband offered himself for Confirmation. He was duly prepared and confirmed; and the Bishop decided that in view of the couple clearly meaning business, she could receive the Sacrament with her husband at his First Communion, the remainder of her probationary period being waived. They are now regular communicants together.

It may be argued that the wife's acceptance of the probation had an effect upon the husband, and prompted him to let the Holy Spirit have a say in the next move; thus indicating that the Church's arrangements are wise and good. On the contrary, the husband said to me: "I got the impression that, if I had said I wanted to be confirmed right away, there would have been no conditions given to my wife at all." These two are thinking people, who understand the need for the Church to have rules here. Their complaint is that the rules are too vague. They have friends in similar situations in other dioceses who have undergone no disciplinary period at all; and that not just because they began going to Communion again without asking any questions.

Could not something definite be evolved on this matter, without our descending to a cold legalism?

Yours faithfully,
JOHN BICKERSTETH.

HURST GREEN PARSONAGE,
OXTED,
SURREY.

"AUTHOR OF LIFE DIVINE"

DEAR SIR,

As the one who initiated the correspondence on whether John or Charles Wesley wrote the above hymn, may I draw your readers' attention to the book, *The Hymns of Methodism*, by the late Henry

Bett (Third Edition, revised and enlarged, 1945: Epworth Press). In Chapter III, "John Wesley or Charles Wesley?" Dr Bett sets out certain canons for deciding "who wrote which". These are based on a patient examination of the hymns that are known to be the work of John, including his superb translations from German. Dr Bett concludes that certain characteristics are typical of John (op. cit. pp. 21–25), and proceeds to attribute several other hymns, usually supposed to be the work of Charles, to John. But "Author of Life Divine" is not one of them, and in fact does not fit the canons at all. So while it remains true that "there is no evidence of authorship", the probabilities are still all in favour of Charles.

Your correspondent, Dr W. K. Lowther Clarke, is in error when he says that the present Methodist Hymn Book allows only one original for certain to John (No. 749). In fact No. 47 is also.

Yours sincerely,

71 Easterly Road, Leeds 8. Frank T. Fox.

[This correspondence is concluded.—Ed., Theology.]

"THE BRETHREN OF THE LORD"

Sir,

I am planning to rewrite, for possible publication, a thesis on "The Brethren of the Lord" and the related question of the Perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, for which I received the degree of S.T.M. from Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois, a year ago.

I shall be most grateful to any readers of Theology who can tell me of any treatment of either of these questions which I may have overlooked, whether in the form of short articles or more extended discussions. I have just finished Hugo Koch's brilliant defence of the Helvidian position (namely, that the "brethren" were younger children of Mary and Joseph) in his *Virgo Eva—Virgo Maria* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1937), and would particularly like to know of any subsequent championing of this hypothesis by a German, French or English-speaking scholar.

Sincerely yours,

(Rev.) Francis Lightbourn.

2521 N. Downer Ave., Milwaukee 11, Wis., U.S.A.

THE WORLD'S CONVERSION—AN IDLE DREAM?

Dear Sir,

What is the point of Dr Glasson's discussion of the idea of a Christian world in your May number? He does not tell us what sort

of a world this would be. Is it, perhaps, something like a Christian country (e.g. England, or Wales) only bigger? If so, it does not mean very much.

Of New Testament references to final apostasy and Antichrist he says that "there is nothing distinctively Christian about them; these are simply Jewish beliefs which the early Christians took over" (p. 188). Surely beliefs are no more Christian for being distinctively so. And the Church's teaching about the authority of Scripture does not encourage us to despise beliefs which were originally Jewish and were taken over by the early Christians. If we are to hold only beliefs which are distinctively Christian we shall believe very little indeed.

Yours faithfully,

F. M. Jones.

The Vicarage,
Penrhyncoch,
Aberystwyth,
Wales.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Word Incarnate. By W. Norman Pittenger. James Nisbet and Co. 1959. 21s.

This very careful and competent study by a Professor of Christian Apologetics at the General Theological Seminary, New York, is an addition to "The Library of Constructive Theology", a series of which the purpose is "to think out anew, in the light of modern knowledge, the foundations of our common Christianity". The author seems to have read everything modern about the doctrine of the Person of Christ that is important and a good deal that is not. He also understands and writes sympathetically if critically about the controversies which led to the formulation of this doctrine in the early Church. Indeed, he covers so much and varied ground that it is impossible to give a fair and adequate account of the book in short space; but anyone who wishes to know what the problems are and how they have been dealt with in modern times can here find the information.

Dr Pittenger's procedure is to show the importance of Christology, to consider Revelation and the Christian faith, the data for the doctrine of Christ and the meaning of faith in him. Then he summarizes and criticizes other modern attempts to expound and illumine Christology, to a restatement of it with reference to "Process Philosophy" and to the self-expression of God in Christ, with notes on the Christian view of man and of original sin; next he turns to the relation of the Incarnation to Trinitarian Theism, then reverts to four problems of Christology, and to the uniqueness and finality of Christ and the relevance of the Church and life within it to Christology.

The conceptions of God and man, of "divine" and "human" nature, with which the framers of the classical Christology worked,

predetermined (unless either the full divinity or the full humanity of Christ were to be sacrificed) a formulation of the doctrine of Christ's person which William Temple (before episcopal office imposed a discretion incompatible with plainness of speech) described as "the bankruptcy of Greek patristic *theology*". I italicize *theology* because theology is not simple statement of religious belief but the attempt to expound and defend it as reasonable in the sense of being assimilable with other knowledge. Begin with conceptions of God and man whose respective "natures" are virtually the opposites if not the contradictions of each other, and to assert that the two are brought together in a genuine unity of one "person", while ruling out all change in either and every conceivable means by which the alleged combination could be achieved, is not a profound religious or philosophical mystery but sheer verbal rubbish. One can neither believe nor disbelieve it because it simply states, in grammatical form, what is unintelligible if the mind attempts to assign *actual* denotations to the words used.

Your reviewer therefore has great initial sympathy with Dr Pittenger's whole approach and method which is, in so far as it is exemplified in the early Church, what we call Antiochene. Dr Pittenger rejects every view of the Incarnation as involving a miraculous act of divine intervention: for him Christ is the actualization of the perfection of manhood. "The 'person' of Jesus Christ as a historical figure, in his manhood, must necessarily be *human*." Yet on the next page he writes

> "We must find some way to guarantee, on the one hand, the fact of his divinity as (so to say) the 'engineering' principle of his life, while, on the other hand, we preserve his identity with us in the possession of every aspect of his manhood save that which is not so much an aspect as a defect, namely sin."

This is what I think to be essentially impossible. All that Dr Pittenger writes about "panentheism" seems to me to amount to no more than that Christ is the supreme example of divine immanence in man and, reasonable or not as this may be, I cannot persuade myself that it can accurately be called "incarnation", certainly not "*the* Incarnation". Nor can I agree that "person" and "personality" to-day mean "the psychological centre of subjective experience". Those psychologists who speak of an ego, soul, subject or psyche, do not mean by it the personality but the basic actual, if non-material, activity without which there would never be the "personality", which is formed or made, not born, and which can also disintegrate. A human ego is sufficient to produce a human person, and if, as Dr Pittenger says, the fact of Christ's divinity is "(so to say) the 'engineering' principle of his life", what *is* this principle if not a divine ego? And are we not then asserting two egos or subjects of all the experiences of Christ, which neither the recorded presentation of his life suggests nor modern knowledge can support? If it be said that there is no *essential* difference between the divine and human, it remains that God the creator is not man the created, nor do I

think the modern mind can conceive the difference as one of degree and not of kind, hard as it may be to define what is the difference between a difference in degree and a difference in kind, and particularly if the difference in degree is said to be immeasurable. When a student at Oxford I was asked in a *viva voce* examination by a very learned theologian whether I held "the core of Christ's personality" to be divine or human. I replied that I did not know what a core of personality is and, unless I were told, I could not answer the question. I was not told, nor was the question pressed. I still do not know and am pretty sure no one else knows. Divested of its Apollinarian element, classical orthodoxy is meaningless; while *if* Apollinarius taught (it is, of course, a big "if") that the Logos was the archetype of the human *nous*, he came nearer than anyone else to a satisfactory theology of *the* Incarnation, and could have pleaded that he was not mutilating Christ's human nature but only asserting its restoration to what it was before the Fall. I cannot see that Dr Pittenger's arguments amount to anything essentially different. Nor can I see any meaning, where Incarnation is asserted, in such a statement that "whatever is divine in operation is *all* God . . . yet not all *of* God". "All" is a quantitative word and his contrast, if at all applicable in this connexion, must imply something not essentially distinguishable from Kenoticism (which Dr Pittenger rejects) or else means nothing at all. Again he writes, "The 'persons' in God are something half-way between nouns and adjectives". Neither thought nor language can conceive or express any such entity, unless it be the activity of a substantive, in which case it makes no difference whether we speak of the divine as *in* Christ or the divine action *upon* or *with* him.

The fundamental issue is this. If the Incarnation expresses anything factual, it is unique, and therefore cannot *ex hypothesi* be "explained" in terms derived from experience formed by leaving it out; since to explain means to relate satisfactorily to knowledge already possessed; and *thus* to "explain" the Incarnation would be to abolish its uniqueness. The affirmation that "God was in Christ" may be made on the basis of human experience, though even this, I think, is dependent upon acceptance of some doctrine about Christ; but of the relation of the divine and human in Christ I cannot imagine that religious experience can have the smallest relevance. Religiously what matters is what God has done in or through him; and, if it may be said with reverence, his metaphysical relation to God concerns God and Christ, rather than me, Professor Pittenger or anyone else. I regret to say that this book would have better fulfilled the purpose of the series in which it appears if it had expounded its author's restatement with fewer interruptions by criticisms of theories utterly inconsistent with it and with more thorough examination of the objections which he must know can be brought against his own restatement of the doctrine of the person of Christ. In my judgment the book confirms Professor Basil Willey's words, which are quoted and not refuted, that "the learned and ingenious attempts by theologians of all times to explain exactly how the divine and human

nature were united in Christ" represent "a standing example of the misuse of reason in regions beyond its competence". In the conditions of our age, theology would command greater respect if it would teach its tongue to say more often "We do not know".

J. S. Bezzant.

St John's College,
Cambridge.

Problems of Religious Knowledge. By P. Munz. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 25s.

The thesis of this book is that we need a new theological method. We must discard "the old view that religious knowledge is a special kind of knowledge of the same world of which scientific knowledge is rational knowledge" (p. 42). True theology is not natural science and it is not the study of divinely revealed propositions. It should be a "systematic description and explanation" (p. 128) of religious "symbols". These arise when, in the course of human life which is otherwise unbearable, we feel a momentary awareness of "eternity". These "feeling-states" are clarified and more effectively enjoyed when they are expressed in religious symbols. Our "symbols" are what we do and say in our religious practices. The symbolic myths and rituals of the religions of mankind are very similar because they use materials taken from such common human occurrences as birth and death, eating and washing, and giving and receiving. But, "The symbols do not stand for a transcendent Reality. They do not stand for anything at all" (p. 99). It follows that "there is no question of truth or falsehood in the symbol picture" (p. 189). They may, however, be meaningful or meaningless, in so far as they express or fail to express our feeling of "eternity". The true business of theology is to undertake a perpetual "interpretation" of the abiding symbols. For instance, the Genesis story of the creation may be interpreted as affirming that "Order is created by goodness and wisdom. This creative urge is irresistible and has intrinsic value" (p. 143). The true purpose of theology is therapeutic, in the sense of enabling men to detect in the symbol picture "an element of eternity, the knowledge of which will bestow *salus*" (p. 143).

I am bound to say that I did not find it easy to follow the precise argument of the book, but I hope that this is not an unfair summary.

Generally speaking, I did not feel that Dr Munz gave a sufficiently sympathetic account of the "old theology". For instance, though he rightly criticizes crude biblical fundamentalism and the excesses of demythologizing, he makes no reference to the great tradition of English liberal theology which is fully aware that no historical judgment has absolute certainty and that no doctrinal statements have absolute finality. I also thought that Dr Munz's thesis would have been greatly strengthened if he had given a fuller analysis of the "feeling-states" from which the symbols are said to spring spontaneously. But my major misgiving about the whole thesis is that I do not see how any analysis of "symbols" can offer "*salus*", if we cannot

explicitly affirm that our "symbols" in some way correspond to what ultimately is. But this criticism springs from the "old theology" and I must not allow this prejudice in my mind to prevent my acknowledging the wide knowledge of comparative religion and the originality of Dr Munz's study of the unresolved problems of religious knowledge.

G. F. Woods.

Downing College,
Cambridge.

History and Christian Apologetic. By T. A. Roberts. S.P.C.K. 1960. 25s.

Dr Roberts, who is Lecturer in Historical Theology at the University College of North Staffordshire, considers from a number of different points of view the statement that Christianity is an historical religion. In the first chapter he examines R. G. Collingwood's *The Idea of History*, and the use (or misuse) which was made of it by Dr Sykes in an article in *J.T.S.* in 1949; and he then makes use of Marc Bloch's *The Historian's Craft* as the basis for a discussion of the nature of historical methodology. In the second chapter he submits three books on the gospels (chosen as representations of different kinds of approach) to detailed criticism, specially in regard to their logic and method: F. C. Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906); C. H. Dodd's *History and the Gospel* (1938); and Austin Farrer's *A Study in St Mark* (1951). In the last chapter he returns to the main theme of the book, namely, the problems which are raised by the claim that Christianity is an historical religion.

I believe that the subject of this study is of the greatest importance at the present time, and that Dr Roberts' contribution to the discussion of it is extremely valuable, even if on first reading it might appear destructive rather than constructive, and to pose problems rather than to solve them. But there has been so much woolliness in previous writing on the historical element in Christianity that a book like this was overdue, and we must be grateful to Dr Roberts for writing it. I was particularly interested in what he says about the relation between the truth of historical assertions and the truth of religious claims; for example, ". . . By maintaining that it is possible to vindicate the specifically historical claims of gospel history, Christian apologetic all too frequently seems to suggest that historical truths by themselves vindicate the great religious truths of the gospel, thereby substituting an unjustified and misplaced appeal to history for the previously commoner appeals either to infallible Scripture or to the infallible Church" (p. 145); and about the historicity of the resurrection; for example, "The basic contention here is that the historicity of at least one gospel event [i.e. the resurrection] cannot be established by appeal to the techniques normally employed by historians and that therefore the appeal in the case of the gospels to

the authority of the 'historical' in support of claims based upon the gospel records is far from being the straightforward, simple thing that Burkitt, Dodd, and Farrer have implied that it is" (p. 162).

If I may make two criticisms, they are, first, that at times the way of setting out the argument seemed to me extremely and unnecessarily difficult; and, second, that it is a pity that, in a book which contains so many criticisms of other writers, the author has not checked his quotations from them: the number of errors in these quotations, like the number of misprints in the book as a whole, is regrettably high.

John C. Fenton.

Theological College,
Lichfield.

Church and Parliament: the reshaping of the Church of England, 1828–1860. By Olive J. Brose. Stanford University Press. (O.U.P.) 1959. 27s. 6d.

Winds of change are blowing through the field of eighteenth and nineteenth century English history. It is becoming recognized that church and state mattered as much to each other then as earlier, and that the social, institutional and economic aspects of religion are as well worth serious study as the intellectual and ecclesiastical. Significant of these new approaches are Wickham's *Church and People*, Murphy's *Religious Problem in English Education*, and McClatchey's *Clergy of Rural Oxfordshire*, each in its way so admirable and original. Many more such are on the way; and of this coming harvest Mrs Brose's readable and good-humoured book is the first American contribution.

Thus runs her argument. The constitutional position of the Church of England radically changed between 1828 and 1833, and its political experiences made conservative churchmen (i.e. most churchmen) think of Cromwell and the Jacobins. The established Church as men had known it seemed doomed. But a Church called established survived, and survives still. How was it done? By administrative and financial reconstruction, to remedy the material defects that had limited its efficiency and given it a rather scandalous air; by vigour in self-defence and counter-attack against the hosts of Midian that not only prowled around but also sent representatives to Parliament; and by adopting in practice a pragmatic view of establishment that enabled them to make the best of a bad job. The usual kind of "Church history" of this period is largely off the point. It was establishment and the ideal of a national Church that mattered most to churchmen; our eyes ought to be on the church builders, the education societies and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, not on the Oriel common-room or the vicarage at Hursley.

At this point I had better declare my own interest. Mrs Brose and I have apparently been working for several years on similar themes. Our conclusions are sometimes very close. If it may be taken as pro-

visional indication of the correctness of a rather new view, that it is reached more or less simultaneously by two independent historians, let what I wrote about "The Constitutional Revolution 1828–33" in this journal, April 1959, be compared with Mrs Brose's characterization of it. We share the same respect for Bishop Blomfield and Sir Robert Peel. The former is her hero, the saviour of the establishment in its darkest hour. I think she overdoes it, but she does it very well. Her outline of the foundation and development of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners is light but accurate and clear; her last two chapters are admirable indeed, and full of what her academic compatriots like to call "fruitful insights".

What faults she has—for who from faults is free?—lie mainly in the bibliography and in a certain narrowness of view. The bibliography is poor—messy, uninformative and imperfect. Where are Sydney Smith's Letters, and Edward Burton's two other important pamphlets? Why no Southey? Perhaps her publisher ordered a (physically) thin book. To have read more would have meant thickening it; but it would have been thickened in both senses. As for that certain narrowness—by sticking so closely within her period, she has misunderstood the Church reform movement. Its history goes right back through Watson, Gibson, Burnet and Laud to Whitgift. What follows 1828 comes directly out of what had been going on since at any rate 1780, and I believe that she has made much too much of Benthamite utilitarianism and the "insurgent middle class". By the same token I think she has read too much into Blomfield. Her account of him, written *con amore*, in isolation sounds convincing, and is perhaps symbolically true. But I doubt if it is historically so.

G. F. A. Best.

Trinity Hall,
Cambridge.

Approaches to Christian Unity. By C. J. Dumont, O.P. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1959. 25s.

Lambeth, Unity and Truth. By T. Robert Ingram. St Thomas Press. 1959. $1.50.

The Anglican Communion in Christendom. By A. E. J. Rawlinson. S.P.C.K. 1960. 6s. 6d.

Father Dumont is the well-known director of the Study Centre *Istina* at Boulogne, which is concerned with the problem of Christian Unity—unity between West and East, and unity between Christians of the communions that stem from the Reformation and "the Catholic and Roman Church", wherein "the unity of the Church in its essential perfection is safeguarded" (p. 132).

To keep members of his own Church informed about other communions, to make them aware of the World Council of Churches and its many-sided activities, and to bring home to them "a deeper realization of many different aspects of the mystery of unity" (p. 21),

Father Dumont has written a regular series of editorials in a monthly bulletin put out by *Istina* with the title *Vers l'Unité Chrétienne.* These have been collected in one volume which has now been translated into English by Father Henry St John, O.P., who also contributes an introduction

The primary purpose of *Approaches to Christian Unity* is to increase in English-speaking Roman Catholics a sense of urgency in regard to the scandal of disunity, and it is to be hoped that it will be widely read by them and also by Christians outside the Roman obedience. For here is doctrine set in the context of liturgy and prayer, a loyal adherence to the absolute claims of the author's own communion, combined with a clear recognition that "Christian confessions, however widely separated they may be from Catholic unity, do not in fact fail to retain . . . a part of the realities, supernatural in character and origin, that the Church they have left continues to preserve in totality and essential perfection" (p. 133).

Father Dumont frankly recognizes the share of guilt that members of the medieval Church must bear for the explosion of the Reformation and he firmly rebukes those of his own communion who are content to sit back and say they have everything, so why worry? In that connexion he quotes a saying from St Thomas which has its relevance to not a few Anglicans also—"if a man excuses himself from doing all that he can by leaving everything to divine intervention he would seem to be tempting God" (p. 84).

An Anglican cannot but be thankful for the spirit of charity and the deep love of truth displayed by both the author and Father St John. He will find much to bring him and his Roman brother closer together in understanding, though not always into agreement, as he uses the material here as basis for his prayer through the liturgical year.

Lambeth, Unity and Truth is a privately printed protest, made by one who is, I am told, the leader of a segregationist episcopalian group in the deep South, against the Pastoral Letter issued by the American House of Bishops at the General Convention held at Miami Beach in September 1958. That Pastoral Letter said a good deal about Unity, both between nations and races and between separated Christians. Mr Ingram thinks that the concept of Unity smacks of Caesaro-Papism and traces all the errors in the Letter to the deplorable fact that the American bishops were writing under the influence of the Lambeth Conference which they ought never to have attended. For "he who accepts Canterbury as convening authority accepts the British Crown who names Canterbury"—and that is to revert to colonial status.

In these days when the Archbishop of Canterbury's presidency of the Lambeth Conference is so generally and happily accepted the argument will seem fantastic, reminiscent perhaps of Big Bill Thompson, Mayor of Chicago a generation ago, who suspected in everything the sinister hand of King George. May a time come, however, when in the developing pattern of the Anglican Communion or of some wider fellowship of episcopal churches through-

out the world the State appointment of bishops in this country will be authoritatively adduced as a hindrance to continuing the present tradition?

If Unity is a naughty word to Mr Ingram, it is a blessed one to Bishop Rawlinson. In his new book this veteran and tireless participator in reunion discussions traces the progress of thought and action in regard to Unity at successive Lambeth Conferences. He also describes the latest developments both in reunion schemes overseas, e.g. N. India and Pakistan, and Ceylon and in conversations with Presbyterians and Methodists in these islands. Bishop Rawlinson writes with admirable clarity and succinctness, and all who wish to keep abreast of current movements, but find it difficult to follow their various stages, will discover here just the concise, up-to-date report they want.

In two important chapters in the middle Bishop Rawlinson expounds, along lines that will be familiar to those who know his thought, the doctrine of the Church, the concept of validity, the demand for a continuing relationship in a united Church with all its parent bodies, the meaning of priesthood and the place of Confirmation.

The first doctrine is the most fundamental. Are we to start in our ecumenical thinking from the "three-branch" theory of the Church so dear to the Tractarians? Or should we frankly recognize (in the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Minneapolis) "that that stage is now passing into another in which Scriptures and Sacraments and Ministry are regarded not as qualifying tests, with a class list of passes or failures" (for "if they are tests, no Church passes with honours the test of using" them "wholly according to the mind of Christ"), "but as creative gifts of Christ to his Church through which he might lead his Church into the fullness of freedom and truth"?

C. Kenneth Sansbury.

St Augustine's College,
Canterbury.

A Mirror of the Ministry in Modern Novels. By Horton Davies. New York: O.U.P. 1959. 26s.

The fiction of any age is useful documentation for a social history of that age, and popular, "middlebrow" fiction is no doubt better for that purpose than great classics, since it is more representative of the ordinary man. Prof. Horton Davies (who wrote an admirable book on Puritan Worship) might have written a history of attitudes to the Ministry as revealed in a hundred years of English fiction. But though it would have been an interesting work, he has not done so and in any case his coverage is too slight and too selective for that. Nor is he writing literary criticism, for only two of the fifteen writers whom he uses are of any permanent importance in letters—Nathaniel Hawthorne and "Mark Rutherford": and the latter is finally dismissed with the judgment that he did not produce "any distinguished religious novels". Prof. Horton Davies, indeed, claims

a high stature for Mauriac, Graham Greene and Alan Paton, but this is not demonstrated by any reference to their style, and he does not show any genuine discrimination between one novelist and another among those he has selected. Indeed, at one point he gives himself away. He says that Greene's *The Power and the Glory* "is a conscious attempt to provide an alternative to the plaster saint of Catholic hagiography". But he has just said that hagiography is "religious propaganda not literary art": and this (in the word *consciously*) implies that Greene is merely substituting a more subtle for a cruder form of religious propaganda. Which I believe to be true. Nor is Prof. Davies writing a sociology of the Ministry (another interesting topic). For only in the case of J. G. Cozzens does he note the social background to the novels discussed. Indeed, in the case of Graham Greene, he is so captivated by the drama of the "whisky priest" that he fails to notice the concealed drama that precedes it—the drama of a Church which so accepted the Mexican *status quo* that only a marxist, not a Christian, revolution could blow it open.

So this book belongs to *pastoralia*. It is a discursive examination of certain pictures of Christian ministers and priests in an assortment of novels of very varying quality from Hawthorne to our own day. It is not very systematic. Prof. Davies complains several times that "the Protestant minister", especially the missionary, has not had fair treatment in fiction; yet, if he has not heard of Henri Hatsfield's *La Flamme et le Vent*, at least he could surely have used André Gide's story of the French pastor? Instead he offers Father Kumalo and Father Vincent (of *Cry the Beloved Country*) as "Protestant missionaries". They would not have accepted the category. Prof. Davies hopes, by pointing to true and false pictures in these novels, to indicate lessons that may be learned from the successes and failures in the ordained ministry. Unfortunately the lessons he deduces are banal, some of them at the level of bright exhortations to a Clergy and Ministers' Fraternal. ("De Vries"—one of the novelists examined—"may not be asking these questions directly, but the Christian minister and layman of to-day must have a direct and convincing answer to these very questions"; "For most ministers the most insidious temptation they ever face is the wish to run with the Hound of Heaven and the socialite and intellectual hares of earth"; "The theme of the need for forthright preaching and speaking on the part of the priesthood is never far from Bernanos' pen" . . . etc.). And sometimes he shows the heavy-handed humour of the same kind of assembly. ("If 'guts' are what an army chaplain needs, Spence had an abdomen-full!"). He closes the book with a claim which would revolutionize literary criticism as well as justify a book like this, if it could be made out: "the delineation of the squalor is a warning, and the portrayal of the grandeur is an encouragement which only the Christian artist can provide." "Only the Christian artist?" Ah, if that could be proved. But can it?

MARTIN JARRETT-KERR, C.R.

CARDIFF.

SHORTER NOTICES

LET WISDOM JUDGE. By C. Simeon. I.V.F. 1959. 9s. 6d.

CAMBRIDGE SERMONS. By M. Stockwood. Faith Press. 1959. 8s. 6d.

The Inter Varsity Fellowship has put us in its debt by this reasonably priced selection from Charles Simeon. Mr Pollard's unobtrusive editing is as apt as his unpretentious introduction in which Simeon's aims and methods are clearly exposed. "He would wish his work to be brought to this test: Does it uniformly tend TO HUMBLE THE SINNER? TO EXALT THE SAVIOUR? TO PROMOTE HOLINESS?" (p. 13). "My aim in the style of preaching is to do it so plainly and simply that all may understand, and be ready to say, 'I could have made as good a sermon myself' " (p. 18).

In fulfilling the latter aim, however, Simeon not only appeals to his hearers as "to men of wisdom and candour" but also assumes in them considerable theological stamina. For in the University Sermons which form the staple of the book he argues closely in favour of such doctrines as the corruption of human nature, justification by faith, evangelic righteousness, the Spirit's work in believers and so on. In the main his arguments still carry conviction to-day. The sermons are preceded by "Hints on Writing Sermons" and followed by a well-chosen selection of "Sermon Outlines".

By contrast the *Cambridge Sermons* of the Bishop of Southwark demand far less intellectual application and doctrinal interest from their hearers. They are set out in four parts: The Christian Year; Topical; Liturgical; and a personal section of farewell. The teacher, orthodox, unspectacular, Anglican, finds his inspiration in the saving acts enshrined in the Christian Year. The man of affairs comments fearlessly on topical matters of Christian concern. The priest expresses a devotion that is centred on liturgical worship. And the pastor says good-bye to his friends. You may be irritated by an obtrusive compliment to the spiritualists in an otherwise straightforward Easter message (p. 33). You may not care for his handling of a certain letter to the *Daily Telegraph* (pp. 72, 73) even if you agree with him. But these are minor details. You will wish to lend out this book to your lay friends; as you will wish to share Simeon with the clerics; especially those at whose feet you may have to sit!

On second thoughts it may be your clerical friends who will derive most profit from Stockwood on Suez, John Osborne or the Wolfenden Report: and the laymen who should nowadays be getting their teeth into Simeon on "The Churchman's Confession", "The Richness and Fullness of the Gospel" and "The Uses of the Law".

A. H. DAMMERS.

MILLHOUSES, SHEFFIELD.

Jesus Christ and Mythology. By Rudolph Bultmann. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 6s.

The So-called Kerygma and the Historical Jesus. By Paul Althaus. Oliver and Boyd. 1959. 9s. 6d.

Jesus and His Story. By Ethelbert Stauffer. S.C.M. Press, 1960. 12s. 6d.

The Dying and Living Lord. By Helmut Gollwitzer. S.C.M. Press. 1960. 5s.

Bultmann's book (which contains lectures given in the United States in 1951) may be recommended as a succinct and clear summary of his views. These views have not changed to the least degree. One might have expected at least some clarification of the word "myth"; but the word remains as ambiguous as ever. By myth Bultmann means sometimes a pre-scientific conception of the world, sometimes the content of ancient mythology, and sometimes a presentation of God's personal (subjective) action in impersonal (objective) terms. Bultmann's aim in "demythologizing" the New Testament is to restate its message in the language of Existentialist philosophy because this language, while not final, is the best available means of relating God's action to the demands of man's existence.

From the outset his thought is anthropocentric. "Not what God is in himself, but how he acts with men, is the mystery in which faith is interested" (p. 43). Moreover God's action is limited to the "address" of his "spoken" word. This restriction of God's saving activity to a present personal encounter has two consequences. First, "only such statements about God are legitimate as express the existential relation between God and man. Statements which speak of God's actions as cosmic events are illegitimate" (p. 69). Secondly, the historical Jesus, being a past figure outside the sphere of present encounter, is irrelevant to faith, so that "historical inquiry cannot become aware of what God has wrought in Christ, that is, of the eschatological event" (p. 80).

Professor Althaus of Erlangen rightly feels that both consequences are intolerable. Most of his cogent and lucid book is devoted to an attack on Bultmann's disregard of the historical Jesus—a disregard that is cloaked by an untenable distinction between *Geschichte* and *Historie*. As Althaus points out, Bultmann's attempt to sever present faith from past fact is incompatible with a belief in a real Incarnation, contrary to the explicit claims of the New Testament, and repugnant to the mind of Luther from whose writings Bultmann freely quotes.

Althaus further urges (again incontestably) that Bultmann's restriction of faith's sphere to a personal encounter cannot be reconciled with those statements in the New Testament which describe Jesus' relation to his Father and his Lordship over the *whole* creation. It is necessary to draw a distinction between the *way* of knowing Christ and the *content* of this knowledge. "I certainly know Jesus Christ first in his relation to my existence. But *what* I then know of him far transcends this relation" (pp. 87–8).

Bultmann's negative attitude towards both the possibility and the desirability of information about the historical Jesus is not shared by Professor Stauffer whose *Christ and the Caesars* and *New Testament Theology* have already been translated into English. Stauffer admits that it is impossible to write a *biography* of Jesus, that is, "a presentation of the psychological development of the inner and outer life of Jesus". But he believes it is possible to write a *history* of Jesus, that is, "a clear, strictly objective, statement of those facts which can still be objectively discerned" (p. 12). He accepts John's chronology and gives a series of exact dates for the pivotal events of Christ's life.

He attempts to explain Christ's ministry as far as possible in terms of Jewish and Roman sources. His use of Jewish sources is disappointing. Rabbinical references (of uncertain date) to Jesus' "magical arts" and "illegitimacy" neither increase nor diminish confidence in the evangelical testimony to Jesus' miracles and Virgin Birth. The author's handling of the Roman background is much more illuminating. No scholar can afford to neglect his remarks on such matters as the census of Quirinius and the trial before Pilate.

The book invites two criticisms, the first general and the second specific. In the first place, Professor Stauffer is committed to an episodic, almost disjointed, account of Jesus' ministry. But it is possible to take another view. If one accepts the Marcan outline a perfectly coherent pattern of development emerges. And Stauffer has not proved that the Marcan outline (as accepted and interpreted by C. H. Dodd and the late T. W. Manson) is wrong. The second criticism concerns Stauffer's exegesis of the "I am" sayings attributed to Christ in the Gospels. It is true that "I am" is used without a predicate in both the Old Testament and the Rabbinical writings to signify the divine presence; it is further true that the expression sometimes seems to have this significance in the Fourth Gospel (8. 24, 28. 58; 13. 19); but Stauffer's attempts to find the same significance in Mark 6. 50 and 14. 62 are wholly unconvincing. The synoptic evidence for Jesus' divinity lies elsewhere.

Professor Gollwitzer's book contains fifteen sermons on Luke 22–24 which he gave as Pastor of Dahlem after he had succeeded Martin Niemöller and before he himself was removed by the Gestapo. These sermons cannot fail to edify and inspire.

H. P. Owen.

Bangor.

Difficulties in Christian Belief. By Alasdair C. MacIntyre. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 8s. 6d.

Mr MacIntyre has written a clear and candid book. In small compass he reviews most of the major intellectual problems which are impediments to an acceptance of the Christian faith. Naturally, the form of the difficulties which he considers is determined by his philosophical premises and by his view of the essence of the Christian

faith. He thinks that it is improper to rely upon the causal principle in proving the existence and in recognizing the activity of God. What is the alternative? The believer accepts the authority of Christ as divine. "What I am arguing is that we too often treat the signs of divine activity in the world as effects of a divine cause, about which we can learn by drawing the correct type of causal inference; whereas we ought to treat them as statements which we believe, as the words of one whom we trust" (p. 116). It would be valuable to have from Mr MacIntyre a longer exposition of the grounds which should lead us to accept the divinity of Christ. The book as a whole is an illuminating exposition of the difficulties which a contemporary philosopher admits without finding them sufficient to make him abandon his faith.

G. F. Woods.

Downing College,
Cambridge.

Religious Platonism. By James K. Feibleman. Allen and Unwin. 1959. 25s.

There is no kind of book which is so difficult to review as one which, like this, assembles a mass of superficial and ill-digested learning in support of a dubious thesis asserted with extreme dogmatism. Either the reviewer must make a few general statements of a derogatory kind, without any detailed setting out of sufficient evidence and arguments in support of them, which will seem (and probably will really be) unfair: or he must examine critically in detail all, or at least a large number, of the half-truths, shaky hypotheses stated as certainties, misleading generalizations, quotations out of context, etc., which the book contains, which will involve him in far more trouble than the book is worth and overflow not merely the limits assigned to him by the editor, but the limits of one number of the periodical for which he is reviewing (unless it is the bulky kind subsidized by a learned society). Perhaps the best thing to do is simply to state what Dr Feibleman is trying to do, as fairly as one who has no sympathy whatever with his enterprise can manage, and to give one example of the sort of methods he uses. He seems to be trying to use Plato's religious thought, one side of it at least, and that of Aristotle to provide philosophical support for his own form of American liberal-social-ethical Protestantism, and to attack and discredit as far as possible the Neoplatonic interpretation of Platonism and all religions, philosophies and theologies influenced by Neoplatonism: the hostility with which he speaks of Philip Merlan's really learned and valuable book *From Platonism to Neoplatonism*, because it tries to trace a line of connexion between the thought of Plato and Aristotle and Neoplatonism, is very revealing of his general attitude. As for the example of his methods, on pp. 76–7, in a rag-bag of detached observations culled indiscriminately from Plato's *Dialogues*, and all put forward as representing Plato's own views, there occurs one which Plato puts into the mouth of Socrates

in the *Apology* and, even more astonishingly, another which he gives to old Cephalus at the beginning of the *Republic*; in neither case, of course, is there any reason to suppose that they express what Plato himself really thought. But the Plato and Aristotle chapters are much the best in the book. Dr Feibleman does at least give the impression of having read his Plato and Aristotle, however superficially, and a few good modern books about them, which is not the kind of impression he always gives in later chapters: in particular he seems almost completely ignorant of recent continental scholarship, and in the fields of later Greek and medieval philosophy this ignorance is fatal.

A. H. Armstrong.

University of Liverpool.

Supplement au Dictionnaire de la Bible—Fascicules xxx–xxxiii. Edited by Pirot, Robert, et Cazelles. Letouzey et Ané. Paris.

This monumental supplement, virtually a new dictionary in itself, though the parent volume is not regarded as superseded, continues to be published under a new editor at a steady pace commensurate with the wide research and exact scholarship which it consistently reveals. In 1948 it had reached the letter J, in 1960 it is now beginning P. Its scale can be judged by the 47 quarto columns devoted to Newman's doctrine of scriptural inspiration, the 76 to a review of the Oriental versions of the Bible, the 27 given to the inscription found at Nazareth recording the ordinance of the Emperor Claudius regarding the violation of tombs, the 24 to Origen; even David's mentor, Nathan, receives 6½ columns. But the palm must surely be accorded to the article contributed by K. Prümm, S.J., on the pagan Mysteries which runs to 225 columns, a book in itself, concluding with a profound study of the word "mystery" in the Bible, Qumran, and Rabbinics.

A reviewer compelled to sample subjects of special interest to himself invariably finds an exhaustive and judicial treatment reinforced by authoritative and up-to-date bibliographies. One feature of unusual interest is the concern for the results of recent archaeological research, profusely illustrated, such as the sites of Nineveh and Nazareth, and the Palaces of the Bible, the symbolism of which for prophets and psalmists is not overlooked. In the article *Nehemiah-Ezra* the tangled skein of literary and historical problems of the Persian period is investigated for 30 columns in the full light of modern critical scholarship to a conservative conclusion. In short, this supplement continues to be a magnificent monument to the biblical learning of Roman Catholic scholars beyond these shores.

G. E. P. Cox.

Liverpool.

WHAT IS UNLAWFUL? Does Innocence begin where Crime ends? Afterthoughts on the Wolfenden Report. By Quentin Edwards. Church Information Office. 1959. 1s. 6d.

Mr Edwards approaches the problems raised by the Wolfenden Report as a lawyer, and the burden of his argument is that there is a category of acts which the law condemns as "unlawful", but which are neither crimes nor torts. "Adultery, prostitution and slander are not crimes, but they are not condoned by the law—they are condemned by it as unlawful." Contracts made for the purpose of furthering prostitution are not enforceable by the courts, and thus prostitution, though not a crime, is regarded by the courts as unlawful. Mr Edwards argues that homosexual acts between consenting male adults could in future be withdrawn from the category of punishable offences, while remaining unlawful. This is definitely a lawyer's argument, as the practical effect of this category of acts on public affairs is small, and many people do not know of its existence. The state certainly cannot in its legislation be neutral with regard to questions of ethics, but it is arguable that the administration of the law can, and that this category of "unlawful" acts is somewhat antiquated.

DAVID NICHOLLS.

KING'S COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

BOOK NOTES

Morals and Man by Fr Gerald Vann, O.P. (Fontana Books, 2s. 6d.), is a revised edition of his book *Morals Makyth Man* which was first published in 1937. *The Religious Orders of Men* by Jean Canu (Burns and Oates, Faith and Fact Book, 8s. 6d.) is a popular historical account of its subject matter with a select bibliography. *St Jean de la Croix et la Nuit Mystique* by Yvonne Pellé-Douël (Editions du Seuil, n.p.) is an attractively produced and illustrated paper-back about St John of the Cross in the "Maîtres Spirituels" series. *How the Catholic Church is Governed* by Heinrich Scharp (Nelson, 12s. 6d.) is a useful guide to the papal system of government: it deals with such matters as the three orders of Cardinals, the Conclave, the Roman Congregations, Tribunals and Offices, and the Pontifical Court, as well as with what the Pope himself does. *On the Authority of the Bible* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.) is a reprint of some recent studies by Leonard Hodgson, C. F. Evans, John Burnaby, G. Ebeling and D. E. Nineham, which have appeared in theological periodicals; it is intended to be the first of a series of publications that will bring together in convenient and permanent form some of the occasional work of contemporary theologians: an excellent idea, and it is to be hoped that the publishers will be encouraged by the reception this book receives to continue with their plans. *A Manual of Church Doctrine according to the Church of Scotland* (Oxford University Press, 15s.) is a new edition of a book by H. J. Wotherspoon and J. M. Kirkpatrick that was first published in 1920: it has been revised and enlarged by T. F. Torrance and R. S. Wright. Its republication is particularly apt in view of the present interest in Anglo-Scottish church relations. From Oliver and Boyd there comes another volume in their new edition of Cavin's Commentaries: *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, translated by John W. Fraser (27s. 6d.). *How Shall I Study the Psalms?* by A. P. Carleton (Christian Literature Society, Rs. 3) is a well-contrived introduction to the Psalter. *I Believe* by G. W. H. Lampe (Skeffington, 18s.) is an exposition of the Christian faith that follows

the course of the Creed. *Saint Ambrose on the Sacraments* (Mowbray, 6s.) is an edition of the Latin text, edited by Professor Henry Chadwick. The June issue of the *Scottish Journal of Theology* contains a substantial article on "The Historical Jesus and the Origins of Christianity" by Professor Hugh Anderson. This is also the subject of the Dean of Winchester's Montefiore Memorial Lecture, *Sixty Years Since: some changes in theological thought since 1900 in respect of the Quest of the Historical Jesus* (University of Southampton, 2s. 6d.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: E. L. Allen, *Christianity among the Religions* (18s.).
BURNS AND OATES: Reginald F. Trevett, *Sex and the Christian* (8s. 6d.).
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (30s.).
CENTAUR PRESS: J. A. Stewart (Ed. G. R. Levy), *The Myths of Plato* (63s.).
CHALLONER PUBLICATIONS: Charles Burgard, *Scripture in the Liturgy* (Cloth, 15s.; Paper, 11s. 6d.).
CHAPMAN: *Son and Saviour* (12s. 6d.).
COLLINS FONTANA: C. S. Lewis, *Miracles* [cheap edition] (2s. 6d.).
DARTON, LONGMAN AND TODD: Paul F. Palmer, S.J., *Sacraments and Forgiveness* (50s.); Howard Clark Lee and Franklin W. Young, *The Living World of the New Testament* (25s.).
DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS (C.U.P.): Kenneth W. Thompson, *Christian Ethics and the Dilemmas of Foreign Policy* (28s.).
EPWORTH PRESS: Alan Walker, *A New Mind for a New Age* (10s. 6d.).
FAITH PRESS: Herbert Kelly, S.S.M., *No Pious Person* (15s.).
HARPER AND BROTHERS: Yorke Allen, Jr, *A Seminary Survey* ($10.00).
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): Gerhart B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform* (£5).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Douglas N. Sargent, *The Making of a Missionary* (4s. 6d.).
HOLLIS AND CARTER: Jean Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (42s.).
INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: F. F. Bruce, *The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel* (3s. 6d.); G. T. Manley, *The Return of Jesus Christ* (4s.).
LONDON BIBLE COLLEGE: H. H. Rowdon, *Puritan Church Discipline* (1s.).
LONGMANS: Ronald A. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York 1560–1642* (63s.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: T. F. Torrance, *Conflict and Agreement in the Church*. Vol. 2: *The Ministry and the Sacraments of the Gospel* (35s.); Giovanni Miegge, *Gospel and Myth in the thought of Rudolf Bultmann* (25s.).
NELSON: Berthold Altaner, *Patrology* (60s.).
S.C.M. PRESS: Gordon Donaldson, *Scotland: Church and Nation through Sixteen Centuries* (8s. 6d.); Norman Goodall and others, *A Decisive Hour for the Christian Mission* (5s.); Philip Mason, *Race Relations in Africa* (2s.); H. B. Porter, *The Day of Light* (7s. 6d.); David L. Edwards, *Movements into Tomorrow* (2s. 6d.).
SKEFFINGTON: J. G. Davies, *The Making of the Church* (21s.).
S.P.C.K.: Max Warren, *Challenge and Response* (5s.).
TYNDALE PRESS: A. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century* (5s.).
WORLD DOMINION PRESS: Donald McGavran, *How Churches Grow* (12s. 6d.).
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): John E. Smith (Ed.), *Jonathan Edwards, A Treatise concerning Religious Affections* (60s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON